

## REMARKS

### **I. Introduction**

Claims 2-8, 11, and 12 are pending in this application, of which claims 2, 11, and 12 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 2, 11 and 12 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment can be found in, for example Figs. 3A and 3B and relevant description of the specification.

A Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith.

### **II. The Rejection of the Independent Claims**

Claims 2, 11, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of Kato.

Applicant submits that the AAPA and Kato, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a data transfer control system including all the limitations recited in independent claim 2. Specifically, the applied combination does not teach, at a minimum, the following limitation:

bus cycle controlling means for controlling the data transfer such that, during a burst transfer, in a single bus cycle, during the single bus cycle, the bus is driven continuously and a write control line of the bus is placed in a write-enabled state for a one-word data transfer period and is placed in a write-disabled state for an (N-1) words data transfer period periodically.

During a single bus cycle, the bus can always be driven, but writing data into the memory is controlled by the write control line. Since the bus is continuously driven, data that still has access authority to the bus, although that data may not be written in the memory for a certain period, is continuously supplied to the bus.

Kato addresses the issue that data transfer cannot be continued when a memory area not to be read or written exists between a data transfer start address and a data transfer end address in a memory (see column 1, lines 47-59). To avoid this issue, Kato has a jump function which can skip a memory area not to be read or written so as to continue data transfer, while an address counter is continuously updated during a bus cycle. However, Kato does not teach that during a single bus cycle, a bus is driven continuously and writing the data into the memory is controlled by the write control line. In contrast, claim 2 recites that a bus is driven continuously during a single bus cycle. Accordingly, because the bus is continuously driven, data can continuously be supplied to the bus although that data may not be written in a memory for a certain period. The AAPA is also silent on, among other things, a bus which is driven continuously during a single bus cycle

Based on the foregoing, the AAPA and Kato, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a data transfer control system including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. The above discussion is applicable to independent claims 11 and 12, each of which recites “during the single bus cycle, the bus is driven continuously.” Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 11 and 12, and favorable consideration thereof.

### **III. The Rejection of the Dependent Claims**

Claims 3 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA and Kato, and further in view of Sheafor et al. and Kreifels; claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA and Kato, and further in view of Fabre; claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA,

Kato, Sheafor et al., and Kreifels, and further in view of Fabre; claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA and Kato, and further in view of Kreifels; and claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA, Kato, and Fabre, and further in view of Kreifels.

Claims 3-8 depend from independent claim 1. Applicant incorporates herein the arguments previously advanced in responding to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness predicated upon the AAPA and Kato. The Examiner's additional comments and secondary reference to Sheafor et al., Kreifels, and Fabre do not cure the previously argued deficiencies of the applied combination of the AAPA and Kato.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-8 and favorable consideration thereof.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

**Application No.: 10/775,124**

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/lrm  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: July 2, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080  
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1417418-1.060188.0767